



Region 6 Briefing for Regional Administrator



April 2017

Dear Regional Administrator,

On behalf of the Senior Leadership Team, staff and managers we are pleased to welcome you and look forward to working with you to protect human health and the environment. We are working very hard here to improve our places with sustainable and resilient approaches to environmental and economic challenges. We look forward to engaging you in all of our efforts in the five states that make up EPA Region 6.

This book will provide you with a snapshot of some of our priority issues that we look forward to getting your feedback and insight on.

Welcome Aboard!

Table of Contents

About Us..... 4

Operations..... 20

Regional Cross Cutting Programs..... 30

Arkansas..... 42

Louisiana 43


New Mexico 44

Oklahoma 48

Texas 48

Congressional & Tribal Maps 52

EPA Region 6 Organization



EPA Occupancy Floor Plan

Office of External Affairs 13th Floor 214.665.2200	Regional Administrator 13th Floor 214.665.2100	Environmental Justice, Tribal & Int'l Affairs 13th Floor 214.665.6448
Office of Regional Counsel 13th Floor 214.665.2110	Multimedia Division 13th Floor 214.665.7200	
Conference Center 12th Floor		
Water Quality Protection Div. 11th Floor 214.665.7101	Multimedia Division 11th Floor 214.665.7200	
Superfund Division 10th Floor 214.665.6701		
Compliance & Enforcement Div. 9th Floor 214.665.2210		
Management Division 7th Floor 214.665.6500	Multimedia Division 7th Floor 214.665.7200	

Office of the Regional Administrator

The Office of the Regional Administrator (ORA) represents national environmental concerns, policies and programs within EPA Region 6. It advises the Administrator/Deputy Administrator on program issues within the region, provides a regional perspective on national policy issues, and makes decisions in delegated areas of responsibility. The RA's Office manages the region's resources to ensure effective use and development of personnel, high productivity, cost-efficient operations and support of the Agency's equal employment opportunity and environmental justice goals. The Office manages intergovernmental activities by working closely with state, tribal and local governments to attain national, regional, state, tribal and local goals. It translates national policy into programs which meet regional needs, makes decisions and manages programs in partnership with state environmental agencies and tribal governments to meet annual Agency initiatives, ongoing program goals and the Administrator's goal of managing for environmental results.



Office of the Regional Administrator (ORA)

Sam Coleman
Deputy Regional Administrator

Samuel (Sam) Coleman is the Deputy Regional Administrator for the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Region 6 in Dallas, Texas. Samuel Coleman brings decades of EPA experience and leadership, from leading hazardous waste clean-ups and emergency response missions to directing Region 6 enforcement activities. Mr. Coleman held several positions at EPA prior to his current position, including Director of the Superfund Division in Region 6, Director of the Compliance Assurance and Enforcement Division in Region 6 and Deputy Director of the Office of Site Remediation Enforcement at EPA Headquarters in Washington, D.C. He guided EPA's response to Hurricane Katrina as the agency's senior federal official in New Orleans, leading EPA's emergency response and recovery missions. For these efforts, Sam was awarded a Meritorious Presidential Rank Award in 2009. Sam has provided extraordinary leadership in cleaning up contaminated sites, from massive, complex efforts such as Tar Creek in Picher, Oklahoma, which holds millions of cubic yards of hazardous mining waste, as well as dozens of brownfields redevelopment sites across Region 6. By working with local, state, and tribal partners to clean up hazardous waste, Sam and his teams have improved the quality of life and brought economic development to communities throughout Region 6.

Office of External Affairs

The Office of External Affairs is responsible for maintaining effective relationships with federal, state, and local elected and appointed officials, community groups and media. The office also serves as the Regional Administrator's focal point for speaking events and Environmental Education. We help ensure that key external stakeholders including academic institutions, industrial, environmental and public interest groups, the media and members of Congress are informed and involved with EPA's programs and decisions. We also provide information about the agency's programs and activities, advise senior leadership on information presentation and timing, prepare speeches and press releases, and we are the point of contact for news media and members of Congress. All communication with Congress, whether by telephone or letters is handled by this office. We monitor all state legislative sessions and potential bills that may impact environmental programs. Other responsibilities include operating the Region's Public Information Center, managing the public Web and social media.



Office of External Affairs (6XA)

David Gray
Director

David Gray is the Director, Office of External Affairs with the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Region 6 in Dallas, Texas. He has directed the EPA's public affairs program for the five state central south region since 1995. He has made it his mission to improve the public's access to the federal government and the public's awareness of EPA's activities.

Mr. Gray opened the first EPA Dallas Public Information Center to provide toll-free public access for people living throughout the five state area. To help increase public awareness, Mr. Gray has led the effort to make available senior government officials to the media across the region, and to the public through a wide range of public speaking events from community roundtables to larger conferences. Mr. Gray oversees intergovernmental affairs, including interactions with Congress, State Legislatures, Mayors, Local Governments and Small Communities, for the region to ensure their concerns and interests are addressed by the agency. He also oversees the Environmental Education program to provide unbiased information to students and teachers helping them better make environmental decisions. David Gray has been working at EPA since May 1987 and has been affiliated with almost every environmental program in the Region.

Diane has been with EPA Region 6 for over 27 years. Her tenure began in the financial areas of the region involving budget, auditing, accounting and strategic planning. She also has program experience in the air program and enforcement. At one point, Diane worked in Headquarters during execution of the 2009 stimulus bill to help set policy and put procedures in place to facilitate the \$6B in state revolving funds to be distributed nationally as part of that effort. Her analytical skills and ability to plan have made her a valuable asset wherever she lands.

Currently, Diane has been the Deputy Director in the Office of External Affairs for over seven years. External Affairs is very fast paced with handling press inquiries, congressional and elected official interactions and managing social media for the region. Diane brings a sense of calm to this hustling office that usually works on quick deadlines. Her goal is to keep management apprised of what is best for the Region and the Agency.

Diane holds a double bachelors degree in Accounting and Business Administration from the University of Kansas. Her passions include helping others through mentoring and providing guidance for their professional careers or personal challenges.

Office of External Affairs (6XA)

Diane Taheri
Deputy Director



Office of Environmental Justice, Tribal & Int'l Affairs

The Office of Environmental Justice, Tribal, and International Affairs works closely with communities to facilitate culturally sensitive communication, find solutions, or reduce environmental challenges. The Environmental Justice program's goal is to ensure that all people are protected from disproportionate impacts of environmental hazards by working with and on behalf of impacted communities. The U.S.-Mexico Border program honors commitments for joint U.S. and Mexico responsibility under the La Paz Agreement for protection of the environment and public health in the border region. The Tribal Affairs program serves 66 federally recognized Tribes on a government-to-government basis, consistent with their inherent sovereignty, to resolve environmental concerns. The Office of Environmental Justice, Tribal, and International Affairs also administers the General Assistance Program (GAP) that awards grants to tribes; implements the Border 2020 plan; and administers EJ2020 throughout Region 6.



Office of Environmental Justice, Tribal & Int'l Affairs (6RA-DA)

Arturo Blanco
Director

Arturo Blanco is the Director of EPA Region 6's Office of Environmental Justice, Tribal, and International Affairs (OEJTIA) overseeing: all Environmental Justice efforts in the Region; the El Paso Border Office in support of the U.S./Mexico Environmental Border 2020 program along Texas and New Mexico; and directing the Environmental Justice and Tribal General Assistance Program. Before joining EPA, Arturo successfully served in the Houston Department of Health and Human Services, where he was Chief of the Bureau of Pollution Control and Prevention. He also served successfully in the Texas Natural Resource Conservation Commission (now known as Texas Commission on Environmental Quality) as program manager of air and waste programs, and as an environmental investigator. Arturo is an honorably discharged and retired veteran of the U.S. Air Force; was conferred the degrees of Master of Public Administration by Troy State University, Alabama and Bachelor of Science in Professional Aeronautics by Embry-Riddle Aeronautical University, Florida.

Rhonda has been with the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Region 6 for 30 years. She is the Deputy Director for the Office of Environmental Justice, Tribal, and International Affairs (OEJTIA). She was in the Compliance Assurance and Enforcement Division (CAED) for 10 years where she was Chief of the Office of Planning and Coordination that implemented the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) program, and Chief of the Hazardous Waste Compliance Enforcement Section. She has a Bachelor's degree in Business, Masters in Business Administration with a concentration in Strategic Management, and a Master of Arts with a focus in Adult Learning.


Office of Environmental Justice, Tribal & Int'l Affairs (6RA-DA)

Rhonda Smith
Deputy Director



Management Division

The Management Division is responsible for laboratory analysis, strategic planning, budget and financial resources, human resources, information planning and management, computer services, telecommunications and administrative support. We are responsible for state and program grants, grants administration, contracts and human resources management and equal employment opportunity. Our responsibilities also include integrated planning and budgeting involving states and program grants; audit management; financial management; information systems; health and safety; quality assurance; cybersecurity; physical security and facilities management. The Houston Environmental Services Branch Laboratory is part of the Management Division. The Laboratory provides quality assured analytical support using state-of-the-art techniques and methodology for organic, inorganic, and biological analyses. The lab also performs technical audits of environmental monitoring laboratories and public water supply laboratories. The Houston Lab is home to the Mobile Laboratory, which is designed to accommodate modern analytical instrumentation.





Management Division (6MD)

James McDonald
Director

James McDonald is the Assistant Regional Administrator for Management and Director of the Management Division at EPA Region 6 in Dallas, Texas. James brings to this position a decade of Agency leadership and service across multiple program offices, and is uniquely qualified to provide advice and insights on a range of administrative management and policy priorities. James began his career at EPA as an Environmental Protection Specialist in 1992 in EPA's Office of Pollution, Prevention, and Toxics Substances. James served as the Director of in the Office of Environmental Information's Planning, Resources and Outreach (OPRO). In OPRO, he was responsible for leading the day-to-day operations of the Office including budget formulation and execution, human resources, program and policy/regulatory development, administrative program and project management, and information technology systems oversight. Additionally, he served as the Chief of Staff to Assistant Administrator and Chief Information Officer. James is a native of Mississippi where he attended Alcorn State University earning a Bachelor degree in Political Science. He went on to earn a Master of Public Administration from the University of Missouri-Columbia and a Masters in Human Resources Management from Webster University. Additionally, he holds a law degree from the University of Florida.

Troy Hill is the Deputy Director of the Management Division and has held this position since 2014. The Management Division is responsible for laboratory analyses, strategic planning, budget and financial resources, human resources, information planning, cybersecurity, physical security and management services. Troy started with EPA Region 6 in 1991 as a water quality modeler and has held management roles as an Associate Director in the hazardous waste permitting program, waste water permitting program and water grants program. Troy has a degree in civil engineering from Northern Arizona University and is a registered professional engineer in the State of Texas. Outside of work Troy enjoys spending time in the outdoors with his family.


Management Division (6MD)

Troy Hill
Deputy Director



Office of Regional Counsel

The Office of Regional Counsel is responsible for advising on the legal sufficiency of permits, program delegation to the states, grants, Freedom of Information Act, general law, personnel and ethics issues, as well as providing official legal interpretation of Agency regulations. Our office develops, implements and coordinates all regional legal activities including coordination and conduct of enforcement and defensive litigation; legal aspects of the Region's financial assistance activities; review for legal sufficiency of many regional actions such as state delegations, permit actions, potential bills in state legislation, Federal Register notices and various other regional actions; and activities which raise legal questions, interpretation of agency guidance, regulations and statutes, and coordination of legal and enforcement activities with state and local governments.





Office of Regional Counsel (6RC)

Jim Payne
Regional Counsel

James Payne has served as Regional Counsel since February 2016, and his background as a senior executive includes extensive litigation, counseling, and enforcement experience. Before joining the EPA, Jim served as the Deputy General Counsel for General Law at the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, managing the law office and advising and representing the agency on fiscal, procurement, labor, employment, Freedom of Information Act, rulemaking, and legislation matters.


Jim spent several years at the U.S. Department of Justice's Environment and Natural Resources Division as Counsel for State and Local Affairs and Senior Counsel for Alternative Dispute Resolution. He played a key leadership role in several high-profile projects, including the response to the Gulf Deepwater Horizon oil spill, the response to the Japan Fukushima nuclear crisis, and development of the 2011 multi-agency Memorandum of Understanding on Environmental Justice. As Counsel for State and Local Affairs at the U.S. Department of Justice, he led an initiative that developed joint environmental cases or projects with all 50 states. He previously served in the Ohio Attorney General's Office as Assistant Attorney General and Senior Projects Attorney in the Environmental Enforcement Section.

He has a Bachelor Degree in Engineering Sciences from Dartmouth College, and a Juris Doctor Degree from The Ohio State University. He completed the Senior Managers in Government program at Harvard University Kennedy School of Government. Jim received numerous accolades and earned many special recognitions, including nine Department of Justice outstanding attorney awards and the Marvin Award from the National Association of Attorneys General.

Ben Harrison has been with Region 6 for just over 26 years. For the past 9 years, he has served as the Deputy Regional Counsel and General Law Branch Chief. In that capacity, he manages office budget and resources and supervises attorneys on a broad array of legal issues including NEPA, Clean Water Act, Safe Drinking Water Act, Ocean Dumping Act, Endangered Species Act, FOIA, personnel, labor relations, grants and appropriations. Ben began his career at EPA working on Superfund issues and also has experience with RCRA and Air enforcement, NPDES permitting. Ben spent several years working on Clean Air Act state implementation and served on national workgroups developing regulations to implement the 1990 CAA amendments. Prior to becoming the Deputy Regional Counsel, he was the Regional Judicial Officer and completed course work in conducting hearings at the University of Nevada, Reno. Ben has served as the Region's Senior Indian Law Advisor and was co-lead for EPA's National Indian Law Workgroup. Ben is also a certified agency ethics official and serves as the senior Assistant Deputy Ethics Official for Region 6.


Office of Regional Counsel (6RC)

Ben Harrison
Deputy Regional Counsel
General Law Branch (6RC-D)



Compliance Assurance & Enforcement Division

The Compliance Assurance and Enforcement Division promotes environmental compliance with federal environmental regulations in partnership with our states and tribes. They are responsible for single and multimedia inspections, investigations, and where appropriate, enforcement actions for violations of the Clean Air Act, Clean Water Act, Safe Drinking Water Act, Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (Hazardous Waste), Public Water Supply, Emergency Planning and Community Right-to-Know and the Toxic Substances Control Act. The division also serves and the Region's focal point for Compliance Assistance, National Environmental Policy Act reviews and the Regional Air Impact Modeling Initiative. These tools aids in the viewing impacts on the environment.





Compliance Assurance & Enforcement Division (6EN)

*Cheryl Seager
Director*

Cheryl T. Seager is the Compliance Assurance and Enforcement Division Director for EPA Region 6 in Dallas, Texas. From 2010-2017, she was the Deputy Regional Counsel for Enforcement for Region 6. Prior to her work as Deputy, she worked in EPA's criminal program for over twenty years. In her role as Regional Criminal Enforcement Counsel, she served as a Special Assistant United States Attorney for four of the judicial districts in Region 6, assisting with the investigation and prosecution of numerous environmental criminal cases. She received her Bachelor of Science degree from South-eastern Massachusetts University, a Master of Education degree from Northeastern University, and her J.D. from Case Western Reserve University School of Law. She is admitted to practice in Massachusetts and Texas.

Steve Gilrein is the Deputy Director of the Compliance Assurance and Enforcement Division. Steve has held this position since 2005; the Enforcement Division is responsible for all major EPA environmental programs, including the Clean Air Act, the Clean Water Act and the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act. Before this, Steve was the manager for the RCRA Permitting Program, and before that a manager in the Superfund Program. In total, Steve has 37 years of federal service; two with the Army Corps of Engineers in Chicago, and 35 with the EPA in Dallas. Steve received his Bachelor's degree in Civil Engineering in 1980 from Worcester Polytechnic Institute in Worcester, MA and his Master's degree in Civil Engineering in 1984 from the University of Texas at Arlington, TX. Steve is a licensed Professional Engineer in Texas.




Compliance Assurance & Enforcement Division

*Steve Gilrein
Deputy Director*

Multimedia Division

The Multimedia Division is responsible for the federal Clean Air Act, Resource Conservation and Recovery Act, Toxic Substances Control Act, the Emergency Planning and Community Right-to-Know Act, the Diesel Emission Reduction Act, and the federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act. The division has enforcement responsibilities for the Underground Storage Tank program, the Emergency Planning and Community Right-to-Know Act and the pesticides program. We work with our states to implement state air pollution control planning and permitting programs and assist in implementing solid waste programs. Our office also works with states to develop and manage the hazardous waste storage, treatment and disposal permitting and correction action programs. The division is also responsible for the Nation's only permitted nuclear waste repository, the New Mexico Waste Isolation Pilot Plant. The office also addresses children's health, lead paint, healthy homes and schools, indoor air and radon.





**Multimedia Division
(6MM)**
Wren Stenger
Director

Wren is currently directing the Multimedia Planning and Permitting Division for air quality, permitting, and state implementation planning, oversight of the Resource Conservation and Recovery corrective actions, underground tank cleanups, toxic substances and risk management, pesticides, children's health, indoor air, radiation protection, sustainability and recycling programs, and climate change. After graduating from Cameron University with a Bachelor's Degree in Chemistry, Wren worked as a wet-bench Chemist and helped establish a new laboratory for the municipal state-of-the-art tertiary wastewater treatment facility in Lawton, Oklahoma. She moved on to work in private industry as a Process Chemist in Vernon, Texas. Wren subsequently completed her Master's Degree in Environmental Sciences at the University of Texas at Dallas and began working for the United States Environmental Protection Agency in Dallas, Texas. Wren enjoys directing a multimedia program organization, strategic planning, process development, guiding organizational change, managing human resources, overseeing program activities, and finding solutions to big challenges.


Lisa is the Deputy Director of the Multimedia Division that encompasses air quality, permitting, state implementation planning, oversight of the Resource Conservation and Recovery correction actions, underground tank cleanups, toxic substances and risk management, pesticides, children's health, indoor air, radiation protection, sustainability and recycling programs, and climate change. After graduating from the College of William and Mary with a Bachelor's Degree in Geology, Lisa worked for a geotechnical engineering firm directing subsurface investigations for large-scale construction projects. Lisa joined the United States Environmental Protection Agency working in the Philadelphia office in the emergency response program and then transferred to the Dallas office due to her spouse's employment relocation. As a staffer, Lisa has worked primarily in waste programs overseeing cleanups and revitalization efforts but enjoys learning about the multitude of programs within her division's purview.



**Multimedia Division
(6MM)**
Lisa Price
Deputy Director

Superfund Division

The Superfund Division implements and enforces the federal Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act, the Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act, and the Oil Pollution Act and the Brownfields program. We clean up hazardous waste sites, provide for emergency preparedness and homeland security, and respond to oil spills. Our office cleanup activities include short-term and emergency cleanups as well as long-term cleanups at National Priorities List and Superfund Alternative sites. We assist communities with restoration of abandoned land to a usable condition. The division manages grants and contracts to assist with funding and has a robust community outreach program to support On-Scene Coordinators and Remedial Project Officers.





Superfund Division (6SF)

*Carl Edlund
Director*

Carl Edlund is the Director of the Superfund Division in the EPA Region 6 in Dallas, TX. His organization assesses and cleans up of toxic waste sites and oil spills in Texas, Arkansas, Oklahoma, New Mexico and Louisiana. In addition, the Division responds to chemical, biological, and radiation emergencies. The Division also promotes sustainable living environments in communities throughout the Region under the EPA Brownfields Program. Between 1977 and his current assignment, Mr. Edlund managed widely diverse programs in EPA Region 6. He was the head of the program that improved air quality for the 30 million people living in the Region. He was also in charge of permitting 3,000 hazardous waste treatment storage and disposal sites; the EPA children's health program; oversight of 50,000 underground gasoline storage tanks; the pesticide regulation program; enforcement of air pollution laws and management of Regional Office funding. Mr. Edlund is a charter member of EPA and is a member of the federal Senior Executive Service. He is a member of the Southern Methodist University Civil and Environmental Engineering Department Advisory Board and a past adjunct professor there. He has received numerous national awards and was the EPA representative on the Presidential advisory Good Neighbor Environmental Board. He received his B.S. in mechanical engineering from the University of Maryland and is a registered professional engineer in Texas.

Pam Phillips has been with the Agency since 1979. She has been the Deputy Director of the Superfund Division since 1995. The Superfund Division includes the Superfund program, the Oil Pollution Act response and enforcement program, and the Brownfields program. Region 6 includes Arkansas, Louisiana, New Mexico, Oklahoma, and Texas. Pam started as an enforcement attorney and was the lead Agency attorney on many of the original Superfund and RCRA cases filed in Region 6. She has worked in all of the Agency enforcement programs, but has spent most of her time in the Superfund program. In 1994 and 1995, Pam worked in the Office of the Regional Administrator as the Enforcement Coordinator. Through the years Pam has had several long term details to EPA's headquarter offices in Washington, D. C. to work on everything from contract issues to Superfund programmatic issues. Pam is one of the few people in Region 6 who has worked in both the legal offices and the programmatic offices. Pam is a 1976 graduate of the Southern Methodist University Law School and a 1973 graduate of the University of Texas at Austin.




Superfund Division (6SF)

*Pam Phillips
Deputy Director*

Water Division

The Water Division provides oversight of the water programs in Region 6. The division communicates EPA's national and regional operating guidance to the states and tribes and assists them in developing comprehensive water programs through federal funding and technical assistance. With these and other resources, states develop the capability to assume federal water programs through delegation agreements. Technical and financial assistance is also provided to state and local agencies and to tribes. We manage and implement programs under Statutes including the Clean Water Act, Safe Drinking Water Act and Special Appropriations grant programs. Additionally, we work closely with states and local communities to protect drinking water sources and to ensure that estuaries, rivers, streams, and lakes are healthy, vital resources for communities.



Water Division (6WQ)

*William “Bill” Honker
Director*



Bill Honker has served as the Director of the Water Division for EPA Region 6 since October 2011. He oversees the implementation of the Clean Water Act and the Safe Drinking Water Act in the five-state area of EPA's Region 6. Prior to stepping into the Director's role, Bill had served as the Deputy Director of the Water Quality Protection Division since March 2005. Bill has been with the Region 6 Office since 1975 and has served in management positions in the water quality, underground injection control, pesticides, hazardous waste permitting, Superfund, and air enforcement programs, as well as in the Regional Administrator's office. He also served as the Assistant Regional Administrator for Management for a portion of 2009. Bill earned a Bachelor's of Science degree in Environmental Science from the University of Oklahoma in 1975 and an MS degree in Environmental Science from the University of Texas at Dallas in 1985. He is a registered Professional Engineer in Texas.

David Garcia has served as the Deputy Director of the Water Division for EPA Region 6 since April 2013. He oversees the implementation of the Clean Water Act and the Safe Drinking Water Act in the five-state area of EPA's Region 6. Prior to stepping into the Deputy Director's role, David served as Acting Director for the Region's Multimedia, Planning and Permitting Division and served as the Deputy Assistant Regional Administrator for Management for a portion of 2012 and 2013. David has been with the Region 6 Office since 1991 and has served the majority of that time in Air Permitting and Air Enforcement management positions. David earned a Bachelor's of Science degree in Civil Engineering from the University of Texas in Arlington. He received a certification as a registered Professional Engineer in Texas in 1992.



Water Division (6WQ)

*David Garcia
Deputy Director*

Operations

Region 6 Facilities

Tulsa Federal Building Tulsa, OK

GSA Owned - Expires 31 December 2022
Primary Use - Office
Facility Area - 367 RSF
Personnel - 2
Occupants - R6 Compliance Assurance and Enforcement Division (OECA)



Tulsa Federal Building



Region 6 Warehouse, Conference & Training Facility Addison, TX

EPA Leased - Expires 31 July 2019
Primary Use - Warehouse, Conference/Training, Office and Continuity of Operations (COOP) Facility
Facility Area - 22,194 RSF
Personnel - 6
Occupants - R6 Superfund Division (OLEM)



Region 6 Headquarters,
Fountain Place

Region 6 Headquarters Fountain Place Dallas, TX

GSA Leased - Extended to February 2019
Primary Use - Office
Facility Area - 259,432 Rentable Square Feet (RSF)
Personnel - 894
Occupants - Region 6 Offices
Office of the Inspector General (OIG)
Criminal Investigation Division (CID-OECA)

Pioneer Building



Pioneer Building El Paso, TX

EPA Leased - Expires 31 October 2020
Primary Use - Office, Region 6 Border Outreach
Facility Area - 1,955 RSF
Personnel - 6
Occupants - R6 Water Division (Office of Water)
R6 Office of Environmental Justice and Tribal Affairs (OEJTIA)

Environmental Services Branch Laboratory



Environmental Services Branch Laboratory Houston, TX

EPA Leased - Expires 30 June 2020
Primary Use - Lab & Office
Facility Area - 41,126 RSF
Personnel - 58
Occupants - Region 6 Lab
R6 Compliance Assurance and Enforcement Division (OECA)

Region 6 Headquarters, Fountain Place

The Regional Headquarters office for Region 6 is located in the Fountain Place Building in Dallas, Texas. GSA is negotiating a 2-year lease extension until February 2019. This space, first leased by GSA in 1987, also includes several Headquarters field components: the Inspector General's components for Investigation and for Audits, and the Regional Criminal Investigations Division of the Office of Enforcement and Compliance Assurance. Fountain place is a 1.2 million square foot, fifty-eight story tower located in the arts district of downtown Dallas.

This prominent glazed prism standout in the Dallas skyline was designed by the internationally acclaimed architecture firm of IM Pei and Partners. It incorporates a six-acre plaza that features pools, fountains and cypress trees. The building received international recognition as being the only high-rise office tower in the world to receive an American Institute of Architects honor award in 1990. Occupying eight floors, EPA is the largest tenant in the building and has a state of the art Regional Emergency Operations Center (REOC) on the 8th floor. The Region 6 regional office utilized open space planning principles to allow natural light on its floors.

Environmental Services Branch Laboratory

The Region 6 Environmental Services Branch Laboratory, located in Houston, provides environmental analytical services for regional programs, and serves as the source of scientific expertise and prestige for EPA's national and regional regulatory and executive decisions. It provides quality-assured analytical support using state-of-the-art techniques and methodology for organic, inorganic, and biological analyses. Laboratory personnel also perform evaluations and audits of environmental monitoring laboratories and public water supply laboratories. Management of the Regional Contract Laboratory Program, including sample scheduling, sample routing, data verification, data validation and data usability, are responsibilities of the laboratory. Technical expertise is provided to the region, and to other federal, state, tribal and local entities. Expert witness support is provided for both civil and criminal enforcement cases.

The original Houston Laboratory consisted of several mobile buildings located near the Houston Ship Channel. This operation was established as a result of an enforcement conference conducted in 1970 and 1971 under the terms of the US Army Corps of Engineers Refuse Act Program. A permanent facility was constructed and occupied by EPA in June of 1972. This facility was designed to handle the classical water quality parameters, such as biological oxygen demand (BOD), chemical oxygen demand (COD), total organic carbon (TOC), nutrients, metals, total and fecal coliform, pesticides, oil and grease and bioassays.

As environmental programs evolved into addressing toxic and hazardous wastes, the requirements for Regional laboratory support changed significantly. The nature of the samples was becoming more hazardous, thereby requiring specialized handling and newer and more sophisticated analytical instrumentation.

Region 6 Warehouse, Conference & Training Facility

The Addison facility, also known as the Lynda Carroll Training and Conference Center, hosts many meetings and training sessions every year for several of the Agency's environmental and administrative programs, as well as emergency response exercises. It also serves as the Region 6 Continuity of Operations (COOP) facility. It was designed to accommodate up to 150 essential personnel if needed to resume regional operations in the event the Regional Headquarters was compromised.

It also houses the Superfund Division's emergency response warehouse, regional storage, and a secure parking area for storage and maintenance of government-owned response vehicles. It is located approximately 13 miles north of the Dallas Regional Headquarters in the City of Addison, adjacent to the Addison Regional Airport.

Region 6 People and Professions


The charts to the right reflect demographic data as of February 2017. The largest proportion of employees in the region are between 60 and 69 years old (35%), and a significantly smaller proportion is between 20 and 29 years old. There are similar numbers of individuals in their 40s, and 50s.

The gender distribution of is the region's workforce is 51% male and 49% female.


Region 6 has a diverse workforce, with employees from all racial categories.

As of February 2017, Region 6 was allocated 756 full time equivalents (FTEs). The diagram, below, shows the number of FTEs in six major professional categories in the region. A majority of employees (50%) are in the Engineering and Scientific profession. Within this category is Environmental Engineers, Physical Scientists, Life Scientists, Chemists, Toxicologists, Ecologists, and Geologists. The category Administrative Support staff includes accountants, grants and contracts specialists, administrative specialists, and financial analysts. Legal staff includes attorneys and law clerks. Operation and Program Support Staff includes environmental protection specialists, program managers, public affairs specialists, program analysts, and human resource specialists.


Age Distribution of Region 6 Employees




Gender Composition




Region 6 Workforce Diversity




EPA Professions Region 6




FTE Chart By Division



**FY 2016 Region 6 Budget by Appropriation
(Total-\$450.593 Million)**



**FY 2016 Region 6 Budget by Category
(Total-\$450.593 Million)**




Grants by States

Region 6 annually manages approximately 815 assistance agreements. The following charts are a summary of all active FY 2016 assistance agreements and the full awards amount. The award amount may reflect several years of funding which is used by our State and Tribal Partners to implement projects and continuing environmental programs.

Arkansas FY16 Grants



Distribution of Grants in Arkansas by Recipient Type		
Recipient Type	# of Grants	Funds Awarded
State	52	\$212,238,912
Counties	4	\$5,270,000
Cities	7	\$2,567,695
Township	2	\$442,322
Not for Profit	1	\$400,000
Special District	2	\$400,000
Universities	1	\$99,100
Total Arkansas	69	\$221,418,029




Louisiana FY16 Grants



Distribution of Grants in Louisiana by Recipient Type		
Recipient Type	# of Grants	Funds Awarded
State	64	\$237,918,859
Not for Profit	19	\$11,488,520
Cities	14	\$4,602,000
Universities	10	\$3,887,933
Intermunicipal	6	\$3,699,998
Counties	2	\$1,352,300
Independent School District	2	\$897,558
Special District	1	\$291,000
Total Louisiana	118	\$264,138,168

Distribution of Grants by Recipient
(number of grants)




New Mexico FY16 Grants



Distribution of Grants in New Mexico by Recipient Type		
Recipient Type	# of Grants	Funds Awarded
State	70	\$153,171,590
Cities	9	\$5,063,921
Township	3	\$1,616,517
Universities	6	\$636,687
Not for Profit	7	\$408,259
Special District	1	\$120,500
Total New Mexico	96	\$161,017,474

Distribution of Grants by Recipient
(number of grants)




Oklahoma FY16 Grants




Distribution of Grants in Oklahoma by Recipient Type		
Recipient Type	# of Grants	Funds Awarded
State	61	\$183,112,861
Cities	9	\$6,482,833
Not for Profit	2	\$1,367,595
Universities	3	\$479,750
Total Oklahoma	75	\$191,443,039

Distribution of Grants by Recipient
(number of grants)



Texas FY16 Grants




Distribution of Grants in Texas by Recipient Type		
Recipient Type	# of Grants	Funds Awarded
State	67	\$962,250,750
Not for Profit	22	\$130,110,871
Cities	28	\$19,111,049
Other	3	\$1,934,562
Special District	2	\$1,692,627
Universities	11	\$1,074,124
Independent School District	2	\$568,152
Counties	1	\$478,000
Township	1	\$161,840
Total Texas	137	\$1,117,381,975

Tribal FY16 Grants & Interagency Agreements



Distribution of Tribes Receiving Grant Dollars by State			
State/Agency	# of Grants & IAs	# of Tribes	Funds Awarded
Arkansas	0	0	\$0
Louisiana	3	4	\$870,487
New Mexico	88	21	\$16,052,628
Oklahoma	140	38	\$49,504,464
Texas	7	3	\$2,401,419
Indian Health Service	80		\$41,686,531
Total Tribes	318	66	\$110,515,529

Percentages of Tribal Grants
(by number of)



Cross Cutting Programs- Regional

1-hour Sulfur Dioxide Designations

On June 2, 2010, the EPA revised the primary SO₂ National Ambient Air Quality Standard (NAAQS) by establishing a new 1-hour standard at a level of 75 parts per billion (ppb). The promulgation of a new or revised NAAQS triggers the designations process. Two rounds of designations were previously completed in July 2013 and June 2016. EPA must complete a third round of area designations for the 1-hour sulfur dioxide (SO₂) NAAQS by December 31, 2017. There are areas surrounding 20 sources in Arkansas, Louisiana, Oklahoma, New Mexico, and Texas that must be designated by December 31, 2017. We received modeling from our states for the areas surrounding 15 of the sources. For 3 sources located in St. Mary Parish, Louisiana, we did not receive any modeling from the State. Two sources, one located in Louisiana and one in Oklahoma, took federally enforceable SO₂ emission limits, but did not submit modeling analyses.

Brownfields Program

EPA Region 6 manages a robust Brownfield program that has helped enable the transformation of Cities such as Dallas, Houston, Oklahoma City, Little Rock and others. The potential for this kind of rejuvenation exists in hundreds of other smaller communities in the Region if funding were available for expansion of the program. The number of entities applying for Brownfields funds increases annually but funding for the program has been flat or decreasing.

Since its inception, the Region 6 Brownfields program has leveraged over \$2 billion in funds for redevelopment; 1,826 properties have been assessed with most of these properties going back into productive use, benefitting the economies of many communities. Over 16,448 jobs have been created with these leveraged projects.

Region 6 sends out a weekly newsletter to over 800 people in Region 6 that provides key information to communities on upcoming competitions and other vital Brownfields information. In addition to grants, Region 6 Brownfields offers two programs to assist communities to get ready for assessment grants or cleanup grants. These two programs include mini-visioning sessions and the targeted Brownfield assessment. These two programs assist small communities with moving potential projects forward. EPA Region 6 holds one to two workshops per State each year on Brownfield topics through support from Kansas State University. Region 6 hosts an annual Brownfields Conference in June. Grantees and those communities interested in Brownfields are invited.

Currently, the Region 6 Brownfield program manages 58 grants in communities throughout Region 6. Some communities with Brownfields grants are Oklahoma City and Tulsa, OK; West

Our designations decisions will be based on modeling we received from the states and on all other available information.

EPA is in the process of reviewing the submittals and modeling analyses we received from our states. EPA will publish a Federal Register notice in the August 2017 time frame announcing EPA's intended designations, which will trigger a 30-day public comment period. In previous rounds of SO₂ designations, third parties (such as environmental groups) have submitted modeling to fill in gaps in cases where EPA did not receive modeling from states or where the modeling received from states had significant flaws. The States will also have an opportunity to submit additional information for EPA to consider before EPA issues final area designations. EPA will issue final area designations by December 31, 2017.

Arkansas Planning District, Southwest Arkansas Planning District, Pine Bluff and Pulaski County, AR; Austin, San Antonio, Houston, TX; and Silver City, NM. Region 6 also has State and Tribal grants with Arkansas Department of Environmental Quality, Louisiana Department of Environmental Quality, Oklahoma Corporation Commission, Oklahoma Department of Environmental Quality, Texas Commission on Environmental Quality, Texas Railroad Commission, Intertribal Environmental Commission (OK), Eight Northern Indian Pueblo Council (NM), Kickapoo of Oklahoma, and Absentee-Shawnee of Oklahoma.

Examples of Brownfields benefits to communities in Region 6 include:

- Dallas – Brownfields assessment of a property that once had paint and chemical factory, a coal gasification plant, and a railroad tank car cleaning operation allowed the construction of the American Airlines Center, the Victory Plaza development containing hotels, restaurants, and a museum.
- Oklahoma City – received over \$8.5 million in funds which were utilized for assessment and clean-up of Brownfield sites in Oklahoma City aiding the rejuvenation of downtown including the Devon Tower, the Skirvin Hotel, the Bricktown Fire Station, the Sky bridge, Lovelink Ministries, Chesapeake Energy Arena, Oklahoma City ballpark, and Oklahoma City library. 300 permanent jobs were created and \$70M leveraged in redevelopment.
- Little Rock – Pulaski County received over \$4 million in funds, utilized for the Creative Corridor Project which is the transformation of four blocks in downtown Little Rock, AR to an arts district. 40 permanent jobs have been created on Main Street.

Children's Environmental Health in the U.S. Border States of Texas and New Mexico



Improving children's health is fundamental to EPA's mission, and one of the fundamental strategies under the Border 2020 Environmental Program. Children along the border in Texas and New Mexico are impacted by high rates of asthma, obesity; exposures to pesticides, chemicals, mercury, lead, vector borne diseases; and poor water and air quality, among others. Children are more vulnerable to pollutants than adults due to differences in behavior and biology. U.S. border communities often face a great public health threat because of lack of basic services and adequate infrastructure, illegal dumping, substandard housing, lack of public spaces or parks, and other economic hardships.

The US-Mexico Border Program and EPA's Office of Children's Health fund grants to educate health workers who work directly with U.S. border communities on children's health issues. Trainings reached over 100 people in three U.S. border communities in 2016, and focused on the Healthy Homes Curriculum and water-borne illnesses. EPA held two Children's Environmental Health Symposiums (El Paso, Texas – September 2015, Brownsville, Texas – August 2016) attended by over 280 participants which focused on: 1) education on how early childhood exposure

can affect children's health; and 2) networking among the health-care community and the public in order to better understand children's environmental health risks along the U.S.-Mexico Border.

EPA will continue to address children's health priorities through collaborative partnerships with other federal (i.e. US-MX BHS, DHHS, CDC), state (TxHHS, NMHD) and local agencies, NGO's and academia. EPA funds activities that address children's health through requests for proposals and partnering with the Southwest Center for Pediatric Environmental Health (SWCPEH).

Continuing Resolution & Reassessment Exercise



The Agency is currently operating under our second Continuing Resolution (CR) for Fiscal Year (FY) 2017. This CR provides the Agency with funding through April 28, 2017, and uses FY 2016 Enacted levels as its base. This amount was further lowered by an across-the-board rescission of 0.1901 percent during this latest 20-week period. Overall, we have received approximately 57% of last year's enacted funds for the first seven months of FY 2017. Once a full year spending Bill or CR has been approved, the Region will receive our annual funding allocation.

While under the CR, EPA may continue current programs and activities as authorized under the conditions of the FY 2016 Appropriations Act (PL 114-223). New programs, initiatives, or activities not authorized or funded in FY 2016 may not be started. Additionally, all offices have been told to operate in a conservative manner while Congress continues to deliberate over FY 2017 funding levels. Section 110 of the CR Bill instructs agencies to avoid any high rates of spending that could impinge on final funding decisions.

The Office of the Chief Financial Officer (OCFO) has typically initiated a funding review process around the June/July timeframe. The primary focus for this exercise is to have all offices review excess payroll and programmatic funding and/

or identify potential savings. In the past, reassessment decisions redirected funds to support major agency priorities, as well as critical enterprise-wide requirements and support programmatic funding realignments. Most of the decisions made by OCFO have transferred surplus funds to the National Program Managers who likewise transfer the funds back down to the Regions for their redirected purpose. For example, last year all regional offices directly received funding for their Working Capital Fund account to purchase new switches.

The Agency currently is not receiving any indication on what to expect with our funding levels for the remainder of the fiscal year.

Deepwater Horizon Oil Spill Restoration



- The April 2010 Deepwater Horizon oil spill in the Gulf of Mexico was the largest oil spill in U.S. history.
- In 2016 the United States (including EPA), the five Gulf States, and BP entered into a \$20 billion Consent Decree resolving claims for federal civil penalties and natural resource damages related to the spill.
- EPA supports Gulf restoration through its work under the Consent Decree, its core duties under the Clean Water Act (CWA), and efforts under the RESTORE Act and Oil Pollution Act (NRDA).
- Under the Consent Decree, BP must pay up to \$8.8 billion in natural resource damages. The NRDA-designated federal trustees – NOAA, DOI, EPA, and USDA – and the five Gulf state trustees are jointly responsible for these funds and will use them to restore natural resources injured in the spill. EPA provides necessary and valuable expertise in water quality, nonpoint source nutrient and stormwater pollution, and wetlands. The NRD restoration work is expected to last 15-20 years. The Office of Water leads this NRDA work and coordinates with the Gulf of Mexico Program and Regions 4 and 6. The current allocation for EPA NRDA efforts over the next year is approximately \$1 million. Work is carefully tracked, charged, and subject to independent audits.
- Under the 2012 Resources and Ecosystems Sustainability, Tourist Opportunities and Revived Economies of the Gulf Coast

States Act (RESTORE Act), Congress established the Council and the Gulf Coast Restoration Trust Fund (Trust Fund). Eighty percent of the Consent Decree CWA civil penalties (\$5.5 billion) are dedicated to the Trust Fund for environmental restoration, economic recovery projects, and tourism and seafood promotion in the five Gulf states. Region 6 Water Director Bill Honker currently serves as EPA's primary representative on the Council's Steering Committee. EPA's Gulf of Mexico Program provides key leadership to the Steering Committee and workgroups, and is implementing projects across the Gulf Coast region

EPA Lab Study



Planning for the evaluation of the Agency's laboratory enterprise began in 2007. At that time, the Administrator requested a near-term review and long-term evaluation of its laboratory network. In 2012, the EPA laboratory network included 34 laboratory facilities located in 29 cities nation-wide. In 2015, EPA completed a Synthesis Report of the US EPA Laboratory Enterprise Evaluation (aka Lab Study) in an effort to collate and analyze extensive laboratory enterprise information to identify opportunities that would increase efficiency and effectiveness while ensuring the Agency's ability to provide the best research, science and technology critical to our mission. The Lab Study concluded that EPA now has more detailed and consistent information about its laboratories than ever before and that these analyses create a snapshot of EPA's network of laboratories and helps to inform a path forward. The results of the Lab Study and the analytical framework developed give EPA the information to prioritize facility decisions, make cost effective use of agency laboratory resources, manage our laboratories as a single enterprise, and ensure the sustainability of our laboratories and the

agency's capability to meet its laboratory-based science needs.

Region 6 has one of 6 Regional laboratories that occupy space leased from private companies. EPA has already made decisions related to the developer leased laboratories in Region 4 and 8. The four remaining labs' leases are facing expirations over the next few years and are currently being evaluated. Region 6's Houston Environmental Laboratory lease expiration date is June 30, 2020.

Options for the future of the Houston Environmental Laboratory are currently being developed in collaboration with OARM. It is essential that the evaluation of future facility location options balance facility costs with the impact of those options on the Agency's mission, as there is a direct connection between the scientific services provided by the Houston Environmental Laboratory and the actions EPA takes to address impacts to human health and the environment.

Environmental Justice: EJ Collaborative Action Plans and the EJ 2020 Action Agenda



EPA Region 6 developed Environmental Justice (EJ) Collaborative Action Plans for each Region 6 state. These community-based plans identify focus areas and key activities and involve working with state government agencies. This has resulted in stronger partnerships and increased efforts to address environmental and public health issues in overburdened communities in the region. Lastly, the action plans assist the region in capturing and sharing accomplishments related to EJ efforts in each state.

In October 2016, EPA released the EJ 2020 Action Agenda (EJ 2020), the national strategy for advancing EJ for the years 2016-2020. EJ 2020 includes three goals, eight priority areas, and four national challenges. Each priority area is led by a national program and regional office. Region 6 and the Office of International and Tribal Affairs are the co-leads for the Tribal and Indigenous Peoples priority area.

EPA will issue annual reports on its progress in implementing EJ 2020. Regions are scheduled to submit inputs for the first annual report by September 30, 2017. In Region 6, OEJTIA will coordinate semiannual EJ 2020 program updates. Program updates on the state action plans will also continue on a semiannual basis,

with the next reports planned for April 2017.

Region 6 recognizes the importance of linking its state action plans to EJ 2020 to show how they support EPA's performance goals in relation to environmental justice. The current action plans have been updated to indicate how their key activities are related to the goals and priorities contained in EJ 2020. Region 6 will continue to use the state action plans and EJ 2020 to support EPA's efforts to integrate EJ into all of its programs and to assist overburdened communities.

Intended Air Quality Designations for the 2015 Ozone Standard



On October 1, 2015, EPA revised the national ambient air quality standards (NAAQS) for ozone to 70 parts per billion. The Clean Air Act (CAA) requires states to submit area designation recommendations to EPA within 1 year after promulgation of the revised NAAQS. If EPA's designation will differ from the state recommendation, EPA must notify the state at least 120 days before promulgating final designations and provide the state opportunity to comment on the intended modification. EPA plans to make final designations by October 1, 2017.

EPA received area designation recommendations from all Region 6 states, but no tribal recommendations:

- Arkansas recommended entire State as attainment or unclassifiable/attainment.
- Oklahoma recommended entire State as attainment/unclassifiable.
- Louisiana recommended the 5-parish Baton Rouge area as nonattainment and the remainder of Louisiana as unclassifiable/attainment.
- New Mexico recommended a portion of Southern Doña Ana

County as nonattainment and remainder of State as attainment, and attainment/unclassifiable. The City of Albuquerque/Bernalillo County recommended their entire area as attainment.

- Texas recommended the following as nonattainment and remainder of Texas as attainment, and attainment/unclassifiable:
 - 8 counties in the Houston area
 - 11 counties in the Dallas/Fort Worth area
 - Bexar County in the San Antonio area
 - El Paso County

For each area recommended as nonattainment, EPA is evaluating air quality monitoring data, emissions data, meteorology, geography, topography, and jurisdictional boundaries. The CAA directs EPA to designate as nonattainment any area violating the NAAQS or contributing to a violation in a nearby area. In early May, Region 6 will recommend to the Administrator our intended air quality designations for the 2015 ozone NAAQS. With the Administrator's approval, the R6 Regional Administrator will provide our intended designations (the 120-day letter) to states by June 2, 2017.

Regional Quarterly Environmental Justice Update Calls



In 2013, EPA Region 6 began hosting Environmental Justice (EJ) workshops in each of the Region's five states (Arkansas, Louisiana, New Mexico, Oklahoma, and Texas). The workshops brought together grassroots organizations and partners, academia, local officials and government representatives to better understand concerns and challenges facing EJ communities. Participants discuss strategies and best practices for healthy communities, and discuss a collaborative action plan that addresses regional and state-wide EJ priorities.

The concerns and feedback provided during the workshops have served as the basis for an on-going dialogue with communities and organizations in Region 6. Region 6 continues to actively engage with environmental justice communities by holding calls with community stakeholders to discuss upcoming projects and activities. The agendas for these meetings include updates on the state EJ Collaborative Action Plans and upcoming national and regional activities. The goal of the calls is to engage stakeholders, share information related to citizen's concerns, engage in meaningful discussions, and work collaboratively to address environmental issues impacting their communities.

Illinois River Multijurisdictional Nutrient Modeling Effort



EPA continues developing technically robust and scientifically defensible water quality models of the Illinois River Watershed in northeast Oklahoma and northwest Arkansas. Once completed, the data can be used to help derive Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDLs) for the watershed and reduce nutrient loadings in the watershed. The watershed is currently impaired as a result of nutrient loadings from municipal discharges and nonpoint sources (e.g., agricultural runoff). EPA plans to release the revised water quality models for public review and comment. EPA also plans to convene two informal public informational meetings within the watershed in mid-April to provide an overview of the modeling and receive public comments. The poultry industry in Arkansas and Oklahoma is concerned that the modeling and possible subsequent TMDLs would adversely affect the land application of poultry litter in the watershed and provide a target loading for nonpoint reductions. EPA has developed draft watershed and lake models, and states, tribes, and local stakeholders have been engaged throughout the project. The models have been scientifi-

cally peer review by independent third parties as well as by state and tribal partners. Region 6 is leading a technical workgroup to address stakeholder comments on the models. The workgroup includes representatives from state agencies in Arkansas, Oklahoma, and the Cherokee Nation. Municipal wastewater treatment plants in the watershed are concerned that they may be required to reduce nutrient loadings to the watershed. These constituencies have engaged their congressional representatives.

Lead Region for Information Technology



On a two-year rotating basis, a regional office is designated by the Office of Environmental Information (OEI) as the Information Technology (IT) Lead Region to support OEI in its implementation of the Agency's information technology/information management (IT/IM) priorities. For Fiscal Years 2017 and 2018, Region 6 is serving as the IT Lead Region.

The Lead Region for Information Technology is responsible for representing all EPA Regions in discussions and decision-making processes, and for communicating the Agency's Information Technology/Information Management Strategic Advisory Committee recommendations, decisions, and implementation requirements to the other Regions.

A bi-weekly teleconference is held with the Agency's Chief Information officer (CIO), Deputy Regional Administrator (DRA) Samuel Coleman, and the Region 6 Senior Information Officer (SIO) (also the Assistant Regional Administrator for Management, or ARA), James McDonald, to establish IT/IM priorities, review progress on initiatives, discuss related issues, and make decisions of Agency-wide significance. Cybersecurity and IT/IM budgeting issues are also considered. Decisions made in these

meetings are subsequently communicated by OEI and the Lead Region through the IT/IM governance structure.

A designated Lead Region Coordinator, Kimberly Graves, assists in this effort by coordinating the various IT/IM-related conference calls and meetings with Agency SIOs, ARAs, Information Resources Management Branch Chiefs, Information Management Officers, and other IT/IM stakeholders. This individual also plays a major role in supporting the CIO-Strategic Advisory Committee meetings, weekly ARA teleconferences/meetings and other activities where IT/IM-related issues are discussed.

The Lead Region system was established in 1984 to provide an organized, facilitative, and consistent mechanism for EPA Headquarters (HQ) and the ten regional offices to interact together as OneEPA. The system enhances EPA's ability to protect human health and the environment and is at the forefront of HQ initiatives in soliciting regional input on Agency decisions, incentivizing participation, and leveraging effective communication.

NPDES General Permit for Oil & Gas



By September 30, 2017, EPA must reissue a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit that covers new and existing sources engaged in oil and gas exploration, development and production activities in the Central and Western Gulf of Mexico. This Region 6 permit is the single largest NPDES permit in the nation, covering all offshore oil and gas exploration and production facility discharges more than 3 miles off the coasts of Louisiana and Texas. 40 CFR § 122.28(c) requires EPA to issue general NPDES permits covering discharges from offshore oil and gas facilities within the Region's jurisdiction.

General permits are mechanisms for authorizing discharges from a number of similar facilities through a single permit, rather than an individual permit for each facility. In cases such as oil and gas extraction, where new facilities are likely to begin operating during the life of the permit, general permits can offer the flexibility of authorizing discharges from those new facilities without the need to issue a new permit for each new facility.

Making a Visible Difference (MVD) in R6 Communities



EPA Region 6 has selected six communities to better coordinate and leverage resources throughout the agency and with other federal partners under the MVD initiative. These projects focused on both long standing environmental concerns and their relation to public health as well as emerging issues within communities. The following summaries describe the collaborative work accomplished and remaining within each MVD community.

Crossett, AR

Located in southeastern Arkansas with a population of 5,500, residents from the predominantly African-American community in West Crossett has been concerned for many years about air emissions and water discharges from the Georgia-Pacific LLC (GP) paper facility. One concern specifically, involves the effects of long-term exposure to hazardous chemicals. Led by ORD, the region continues to move forward in developing a conceptual site model in the community in order to address this major concern. The Region has also partnered with ADEQ and ADH to address concerns with GP's state-issued permits, area water quality standards, and area drinking water.

Cochiti Pueblo, NM

Pueblo de Cochiti is interested in integrating green infrastructure into land use planning, stormwater management, infrastructure improvements, transportation planning and open space to enhance community and tribal lands. Technical assistance in green infrastructure, further assessment of Brownfields, and potential area-wide planning projects have been discussed as ways EPA will assist the community in the areas they have targeted.

To date, local officials, the Tribal Governor and Lt. Governor, Pueblo residents, various federal and state agency representatives, and other key stakeholders met in the Pueblo for a 1.5-day workshop that included a tour of the community. The workshop, led by EPA Region 6 and consultants presented how green and complete streets concepts could be applied into the Pueblo and opportunities for incorporating green and complete streets elements into future street improvements that would include high speed highways, mid and low volume roads and streets, as well as traditional dirt paths. The workshop focused on leveraging the Pueblo's strong relationship with the local environment and interest in retaining its historic and cultural traditions to build a green and complete street strategy that is appropriate for a rural desert southwest pueblo community. Attendees identified four main focus areas (1) Partnerships, 2) Education, 3) Strategy and 4) Implementation) to advance the green and complete streets concepts and achieve a strategic plan for long term viability of green and complete streets within the Pueblo de Cochiti.

The Pueblo de Cochiti requested and received Targeted Brownfields Assessment Assistance on an abandoned gravel mine which

included Phase I environmental site assessment (ESA) and two Phase II ESAs from EPA Region 6 and from Eight Northern Pueblo Councils Tribal Response Program from FY 2014 through FY 2016. In FY 2017, EPA is assisting the Pueblo of Cochiti with contract support/assistance to identify sustainable reuse options for abandoned gravel mine through the Land Revitalization contract and to develop a cleanup plan through the Brownfields Interagency Agreement with US Army Corps of Engineers.

Anthony, NM

Formed in 2010, the City of Anthony, NM encompasses 4 square miles. The population is 9,360 of which 97.4% are Hispanic. The city has an 8.4% unemployment rate with 41.3% residents living in poverty. The City does not own any of its utilities. Anthony lacks land use strategies, has a severe deficit of public recreational facilities, and lacks adequate zoning and subdivision regulations. A concentrated coordinated effort is needed between stakeholders/utilities to mutually plan future growth.

Through smart growth approaches that enhance neighborhoods and involve residents in development decisions, communities like the City of Anthony, New Mexico, is creating a vibrant place to live, work, and play, creating business opportunities, and strengthening the local tax base. EPA works on smart growth issues to help communities like the City of Anthony develop in ways that are better for health and the environment. In early 2016, EPA Region 6, consultants, as well as representatives from Housing and Urban Development (HUD), local governments, and other key stakeholders participated in workshops in Anthony to discuss specific strategies the community could take to address their goals to strengthen the local economy, efficiently provide infrastructure, revitalize the historic commercial centers and improve housing choices. The City is positioned to grow and has the opportunity to shape that growth and quality of life into a more sustainable way based upon four major goals the city is pursuing (designate and revitalize existing town centers, provide quality housing options, strengthen the local economy, and provide efficient infrastructure).

EPA with the assistance from Kansas State University, technical assistance for Brownfields community grantee, and New Mexico Environment Department conducted a Brownfields 101 webinar for the City of Anthony, NM in June 2016. Following up from the webinar, the Mayor of Anthony requested Targeted Brownfields Assessment assistance to conduct a Phase I and II ESA on 216 North Main Street, Anthony, NM, a priority Brownfields property. Future reuse plans for this property is mixed-use/retail to revitalize Anthony's Main Street.



Alexandria/Pineville, LA

These two communities encompass multiple hazardous waste sites, including two active creosoting companies, two remediated EPA Superfund sites and a state-lead inactive waste site. All identified sites are within a 2-mile radius in close proximity to neighborhood schools and residential areas that are 87% and 57% minority for Alexandria and Pineville, respectively. A Community Sustainability Initiative was developed through two Community Scoping Sessions to begin the collaborative problem solving process working towards sustainable solutions to health and environmental issues identified by the community.

Several community meetings have been held with community members, industry representatives, as well as interested environmental activists (General Honore' of the Green Army and Wilma Subra with the Louisiana Environmental Action Network). EPA has organized a series of projects to address concerns that were voiced in the community meetings consisting of air and soil sampling, community outreach, and development of a Community Sustainability Network which is an assembly of community stakeholders working together to resolve community concerns.

A major goal of this project was to collect soil sampling data in local parks and schools and compile that data along with air monitoring data collected by LDEQ from 2013 to 2015. The data will be compiled in an easy to read report which should help empower the community to discuss and resolve issues through the CSN.

EPA hosted the first CSN meeting on February 2, 2016. The CSN is currently being facilitated by State Representative Jeff Hall with the help of representatives of the Rapides Area Planning Commission.

Lastly, a Community Data Assessment Report, which summarizes the several focused projects carried out since 2015, is under EPA review and is in the process of being sent for LDEQ review.

Choctaw Nation, OK

The Choctaw Nation requested Brownfields assistance to redevelop a closed middle school complex into a native serving Boys and Girls Club and new office space. This work includes abating asbestos and lead-based paint in buildings. Other priorities include:

- improving infrastructure and providing training and technical assistance to help the Tribe comply with safe drinking water standards and build capacity
- developing Household Hazardous Waste outreach and collection events
- developing local food systems with support from the federal Local Foods, Local Places Initiative

Designation as a federal "Promise Zone" may bring additional support for local priorities.

Unincorporated Texas Communities

Colonias and Unincorporated Texas Communities

In Texas, there are 555 colonias which lack adequate road paving, drainage or solid waste disposal. An additional 337 lack access

to potable water, adequate wastewater disposal, or are in areas with no infrastructure. This amounts to 153,842 people experiencing infrastructure challenges that could lead to serious environmental health risks. In addition to the number of recognized colonias in Texas, there are over a thousand unincorporated communities that are not connected to drinking or wastewater systems or have waste management services. Environmental health risks increase when community wells become contaminated, septic tanks are not properly installed or maintained, and during natural disasters. EPA is working side by side with state, federal, local and NGOs in creating strategic /implementation plans to address drinking water and waste water issues; flood-related septic tank challenges; emergency preparedness; and superfund outreach and public engagement challenges.

Examples of collaborative community efforts include; **Cyndie Park II, TX:** This neighborhood in Nueces County, Texas has approximately 50 residents, all of whom rely on private wells for their drinking water. Water from these wells exceeds the national standard for arsenic. EPA is working with the community and the Texas Water Development Board to provide the residents of Cyndie Park 2 and surrounding neighborhoods with long-term source of safe drinking water.

Lower Rio Grande Valley (LRGV) Colonias – Including the City of Alamo and Donna: EPA is working with community leaders representing 14 colonias, NGOs, local, state and federal partners to address a malfunctioning open lagoon wastewater facility, the cleanup, enforcement and public awareness needs related to the Donna Canal Superfund Site, and enhance emergency preparedness of residents. EPA designed a strategy to better connect colonia residents to first responders, non-for-profit assistance organizations, and helped develop a network for emergency communication. EPA and its partners are also working with the North Alamo Water Supply Corporation on funding options to develop a mechanical sanitary sewer system that will address the environmental health concerns of the malfunctioning wastewater treatment lagoon in the middle of a community, and an extensive outreach strategy to deter people from eating contaminated fish from the Donna Canal Superfund Site is underway.

Sandbranch, TX: EPA has facilitated conversation between many partners, including Dallas County, USDA-RD, FEMA, US-ACE, TCEQ, community leaders and nonprofit organizations to explore drinking water, wastewater options for an unincorporated community with about 100 residents whose drinking water wells became contaminated over 30 years ago. The small community sits approximately 30 mile SE of Dallas in a floodplain. EPA has examined past failed efforts, has brought additional players to the table, and has led discussions to develop a joint agreement on the feasibility of a solution to the issue. The preliminary engineering study has been completed and the community is in the application process for a USDA-RD grant for 75% of the cost of the construction.

Minor NSR Public Participation Disapprovals – Oklahoma and Louisiana State Implementation Plans



Federal air regulations require notice and opportunity for public comment as part of the minor New Source Review (NSR) permitting programs. Based on this requirement, the EPA is finalizing a disapproval of the SIP revisions for minor NSR permit public participation requirements in Louisiana and potentially proposing to disapprove “Tier 1” public participation provisions in Oklahoma. Since both of these disapproval actions pertain to minor NSR permitting, both were triaged through the Office of Air Quality Planning and Standards (OAQPS) and the Office of General Counsel (OGC) for national consistency purposes prior to the Region proposing the actions. EPA has taken an active role in discussing the prospective actions with both of the States’ air permitting authorities, attempting to find other solutions such as pursuing revised rule making at the State level.

In Louisiana, the deficiency allowed for discretionary public notice for minor NSR actions instead of requiring public notice for minor NSR permitting actions. Our Louisiana action was proposed in 2016 and we received no public comments on the proposed action to disapprove. Our final action for Louisiana is targeted for

signature by the Regional Administrator on April 5, 2017.

In Oklahoma, the deficiencies concern the State’s “Tier” category permitting application process which does not require the opportunity for public comment on permitting actions for minor facilities (sources) and minor modifications to existing major sources. Our discussions are continuing with Oklahoma before we introduce a possible proposed SIP action into concurrence. Regarding the prospective Oklahoma action, the draft proposal to disapprove the public notice portion of the rules is targeted for RA signature in March 2017, but this date is subject to change pending additional discussions with ODEQ about its minor NSR permitting rules.

Remedial Action Contract



For the last 10 years, all regional offices have used full-service Remedial Action Contract system for federally funded assessment and cleanup of Superfund sites. Under this contracting system, the same contractor worked on all phases of worksite investigation, remedial design, and remedial construction. Headquarters awarded these contracts after national competition. The Region 6 contracts are scheduled to expire in 2019.

After several audits that criticized the use of a single contractor to perform all site work, the Office of Management and Budget stated EPA needed to develop a replacement contract mechanism with the goal to maximize competition, realize cost efficiency and strengthen the contract management processes. EPA developed a replacement contracting process called the Remedial Acquisition Framework. Under this new system, replacement contracts will be awarded nationally and each region will have up to 10 contractors in each of three categories: site investigation, remedial design, and remedial construction. Regions will be responsible for obtaining competitive bids from contractors in each category

for individual task orders.

This system will meet the OMB goal to maximize competition, but at a cost to EPA staffing. The new process will be labor intensive, increase administrative costs of cleanup and add a year or more to the time required to address the site. Further delays could also result from bid protests among the qualified contractors. Since the Superfund budget has been flat for several years, the increased administrative costs will result in less money available for site work.

The schedule for awarding the RAF contracts has been delayed by at least a year. If further delays occur, site cleanups could be halted indefinitely.

RCRA Land Revitalization Program



Over the last 20 years, EPA Region 6 has been a national leader in the RCRA Program by providing assistance to our states in streamlining the cleanup process, and promoting the productive reuse of properties that have been investigated and, if necessary, cleaned up.

Contaminated properties (real or perceived) often sit idle, abandoned, underutilized or warehoused because of the inherent disincentives to investigating and remediating sites, such as unrealistic remedial objectives, cost, liability issues, lack of a formal mechanism that recognizes that environmental conditions are protective prior to achieving final cleanup objectives, etc.

In 2000, Region 6 developed the Corrective Action Strategy (CAS), a Regional corrective action streamlining approach, to accelerate corrective action through the use of practical, performance- and risk-based approaches to site characterization and cleanup, focusing on the current and future use of the property. (The previous process-driven approach to corrective action was overly time-consuming and costly.) Since 2000, the CAS has been used by Region 6 states and private companies to complete investigations and cleanups sooner than would have been achieved using conventional means, by helping them define with certainty what

their environmental obligations and requirements will be up-front, thus allowing for better planning and implementation of remedies that are cost effective while being protective of human health and the environment.

Accordingly, in 2002, EPA Region 6 developed the Ready for Reuse (RfR) concept as a new measure of remedial progress in the corrective action process. It subsequently became a cross-program benchmark for all the EPA/State land-based cleanup programs. RfR promotes expedited investigation and remediation of sites by considering the end use of a property up front, and also facilitates their reuse/redevelopment by explaining, in a straightforward manner, the technical basis for the determination, the environmental conditions on the property, and any land use limitations. The RfR provides comfort to stakeholders by affirming that conditions on a property are protective of human health and the environment based on its current and planned future use.

Treatment as a State (TAS) Lean Project



The Clean Water Act, Safe Drinking Water Act, and Clean Air Act emphasize the role of states in protecting the environment and public health and allow EPA to authorize states to implement their own programs in lieu of the federal program (referred to as program authorization). From 1986 to 1990, Congress amended these three acts to authorize EPA to treat pueblos and tribal nations in a similar manner as a state (TAS) for purposes of program authorization.

Under EPA's implementation of the Clean Water Act, a tribe may submit a request to EPA for TAS status and a request for approval of its adopted water quality standards (WQS), either separately or at the same time. Section 518 of the Clean Water Act lists the eligibility criteria EPA will use to approve TAS status and to authorize Indian tribes to administer Clean Water Act programs.

Region 6 currently has 13 pueblos and tribal nations that have achieved TAS status for WQS, and 11 pueblos have federally-approved WQS.

The last four TAS applications for WQS have taken over two years to approve, and a current Clean Air Act grant TAS application is approaching two and a half years for approval. The length of recent approvals has necessitated that EPA examine the process to shorten the time from review and making a decision. This examination led to a creation of a Lean project focused on reducing the time required for approval of a TAS application. A Lean project team comprised of EPA Region 6 and Tribal environmental staff members is currently working on the project.

US – Mexico Border in the States of Texas & New Mexico-Colonias



A colonia is an underserved community along the US–Mexico border that may lack basic living necessities such as potable water, septic or sewer systems, electricity, or safe and sanitary housing, creating a number of health threats for residents of these communities. Of the four US border states, Texas has the 2,294 colonias and the largest colonia population, approximately 4000,000 inhabitants.

EPA has funded a number of projects to help address environmental issues facing colonia residents, including grants for environmental education on the proper maintenance and decommissioning of septic tanks in Southern New Mexico and West Texas. In addition, in a partnership with EPA’s Office of Children’s Health, EPA has trained community health workers along the border on the Healthy Homes curriculum that addresses the indoor environment. In August 2016, the Border Program and the Environmental Justice Program collaborated to assist local stakeholders organize a Colonias Emergency Preparedness Conference in Alamo, Texas. Over 110 colonia residents attended the event to learn how to prepare for, survive and recover from a disaster.

EPA has been holding the Border 2020 Taskforce public meetings to get input from the public and border stakeholders on priorities. The agencies that work in colonias attend these meetings and provide input to EPA on what environmental priorities in these underserved communities should be considered. EPA will incorporate these priorities in the Region’s work plan, just as it does with other concerns raised by the public at a Task Force meetings. The concerns will also be considered for incorporation into the next Request For Proposals for the Border Program.

US-Mexico Border Program: B2020



EPA and Mexico’s Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources (SEMARNAT), along with partnerships among U.S. Border tribes and federal, state and local governments in the United States and Mexico, have moved forward in fulfilling the Border Program’s mission. The mission is to protect the environment and public health, consistent with the principles of sustainable development, defined and given by the framework of the 1983 La Paz Agreement. The agreement contains an organizational structure of coordinating bodies that includes U.S. tribes and states’ executive officers and chairmanship, chaired by the regional administrator and Mexico’s federal delegate convened as a Regional Work Group (RWG) with a primary function to identify and prioritize regional implementation efforts that addresses the goals and objectives of Border 2020 (B2020). Within R6 we have two RWGs: New Mexico-Texas-Chihuahua and Texas-Coahuila-Nueva Leon-Tamaulipas.

At the February 2017 biennial meeting, the R6 RWG reviewed the status of the existing two-year action plans and accepted

priorities to be included in the next two-year action plans. The Regional Administrator, as RWG Chair, will recommend those issues in the RWG’s two-year action plan to the National Coordinating Body at EPA-OITA and UCAI-SEMARNAT.

As EPA’s RWG Chair, the Regional Administrator will approve the new 2-Year Action Plans that resulted from the biennial public meetings. The meetings took place in El Paso, Texas on February 14, 2017 for the Texas-Chihuahua-New Mexico region which include the Ysleta del Sur Pueblo, and in Laredo, Texas on February 16, 2017 for the Texas-Coahuila-Nuevo Leon-Tamaulipas region which include the Kickapoo Traditional Tribe of Texas. These biennial meetings advance the B2020 goals and objectives.

US-Mexico Border Grants



The Border Environment Cooperation Commission (BECC) coordinates projects and internal contract and grant administration in coordination with EPA for the Border 2020 grants program. BECC monitors work plan activities of the projects in coordination with EPA, which includes reviews of expenditures of grant agreement funds and progress of work according to deadlines.

The Border grants cover the Tri-State Region, which include the Ysleta del Sur Pueblo, the states of New Mexico, Chihuahua and West Texas region, and the Four-State Region that includes the Kickapoo Traditional Tribe of Texas, the states of Texas, Coahuila, Nuevo Leon, and Tamaulipas.

BECC provides logistical support for the Region 6 Border 2020 program and meetings, which alternate between locations in the U.S. and in Mexico. BECC provides simultaneous translation at the Border 2020 regional workgroups' annual public meetings, task force meetings, annual policy forums, and bi-annual committees meeting. They also organize facilities, invitations, and minutes for the meetings.

BECC will assist with developing a Request for Proposals based on EPA's priorities, providing workshops in border communities in both U.S. and Mexico to provide bilingual guidance on the application and submittal process. They also provide logistical support for the National Coordinators Meeting required by the 1983 La Paz Agreement, attended by U.S/MX federal chairpersons, state environmental secretaries/delegados.

Water Infrastructure Needs information for Region 6 states and tribes



EPA conducts an assessment of infrastructure needs to support the CWA and SDWA Revolving Loan Funds. These estimates are updated regularly on a four - year cycle. The most recent Report to Congress 2012 for CWA and 2011 for SWDA indicate the following. (Needs are shown in millions of US dollars.)

IHS office total need was \$156, which includes tribes in New Mexico and Colorado. Oklahoma's IHS office total need was \$113, which includes tribes in Oklahoma and Kansas. Nashville's IHS office total need was \$176, which includes tribes in Texas, Louisiana and 26 other states.

STATE	CWA	SDWA
Arkansas	\$715	\$6,098
New Mexico	\$320	\$1,165
Louisiana	\$4,462	\$5,323
Oklahoma	\$2,410	\$6,494
Texas	\$11,830	\$33,892

Region 6 currently works with three Indian Health Service (IHS) offices to implement allocated SRF tribal set-aside funding. Clean Water and Drinking Water total needs in 2016 (numbers are US dollars in millions) are totaled for the IHS offices. Albuquerque's

Cross Cutting Programs-Arkansas

Arkansas Regional Haze Federal Implementation Plan



On August 31, 2016, EPA promulgated a final Federal Implementation Plan (FIP) that established sulfur dioxide (SO₂), nitrogen oxide (NO_x), and particulate matter (PM) emission limits for 11 units at 7 facilities in Arkansas under the Regional Haze Rule. The FIP was promulgated to correct certain portions of the Arkansas Regional Haze State Implementation Plan (SIP), which EPA partially disapproved in a prior action finalized on March 12, 2012.

In November 2016, EPA received petitions for reconsideration from the State of Arkansas as well as four industry parties. Five parties also filed petitions for judicial review of certain parts of the FIP. The State of Arkansas and other parties to the litigation have expressed interest in settlement discussions/negotiations. To facilitate settlement discussions, on March 1 and March 6, EPA sent letters to the petitioners communicating our intent grant a 90-day administrative stay and partial reconsideration of (1) the SO₂ controls for the White Bluff Power Plant, (2) the form and compliance date of NO_x controls for White Bluff Power Plant,

Independence Power Plant, and Flint Creek Power Plant, and (3) reconsideration of the compliance date for SO₂ controls for the Independence Power Plant. On March 8, 2017, the Eighth Circuit granted EPA's abeyance motion to halt the litigation briefing schedule for 90 days in order for EPA to conduct settlement talks with petitioners.

EPA and DOJ are currently communicating with the parties to the litigation and we anticipate commencing settlement discussions with the State and other petitioners shortly. EPA is required to provide the Court a status report on June, 9, 2017 on our efforts to settle with petitioners, at which time the Court will determine if progress has been made or if it is necessary to resume the litigation schedule.

Cross Cutting Programs-Louisiana

Explo Systems, Inc. Camp Minden



In October 2012, one of 97 bunkers at the Louisiana National Guard facility near Minden, Louisiana, exploded shattering windows up to four miles away. The investigation by State Police found that unstable material self-ignited, and that Explo Systems, the business on the property, had also improperly stored 20,000,000 pounds of deteriorating ignitable material. Most of this material had been shipped to the site for recycling by the US Army. In August 2013 Explo declared bankruptcy and EPA began negotiations with the Army to fund a Superfund emergency cleanup. In October 2014 a consent agreement was signed by EPA, the Army, the Department of Justice, the Louisiana Environment Department and the Louisiana Military Department. The agreement provided funding for the Louisiana Military Department to employ a contractor to safely destroy the abandoned material through controlled open burning with EPA oversight.

Initial public reaction to the agreement was extremely negative. Citizens and elected officials were very concerned that huge amounts of air pollution would be created by open burning the material. After several months of intensive collaboration with the community, a contained burning chamber remedy was developed

and approved by Louisiana and EPA. The system (largest and most advanced ever built) started on-site operation in April 2016 and will be finished destroying the abandoned munitions in April 2017. Complete site work will require several additional months.

Currently, the Minden business community has advocated for the burn chamber to remain in the area as a for-profit commercial operation. Some community members are interested in jobs that this would create, but others oppose the idea of creating a hazardous waste disposal operation at Camp Minden. This topic is currently the focus at public meetings involving local and state officials. The current approved work plan would require the unit to be dismantled and removed from the site. Transitioning to a commercial operation requires permitting by the State.

Denka Facility



The Denka facility, located in LaPlace, Louisiana, is the only place in the United States currently manufacturing neoprene. EPA became aware of the potential risk associated with the facility's emissions of chloroprene, a primary chemical used in the manufacture of neoprene, in December 2015 as a result of EPA's National Air Toxics Assessment (NATA).

EPA's 2015 National Air Toxics Assessment showed elevated levels of chloroprene emissions in La Place, Louisiana. There is no federal air standard for chloroprene emissions. In March 2016, EPA and the Louisiana Department of Environmental Quality (LDEQ) confirmed elevated concentrations of chloroprene from the Denka Performance Elastomer (Denka) facility in LaPlace, Louisiana. In July 2016, EPA, LDEQ, and Denka met with local officials and citizens to inform them about potential health risks of chloroprene and outline actions the facility was evaluating to reduce emissions from the plant. In January 2017, LDEQ and Denka signed an agreement to reduce emissions through installation of a thermal oxidizer and other pollution control measures.

EPA continues to monitor ambient air in the neighborhoods surrounding the facility and release data on its website. Chloroprene concentrations continue to be elevated. EPA and LDEQ are working with Denka to install pollution control technology to reduce ambient emission levels in the community.

Lake Pontchartrain Basin Restoration Program Federal Assistance Oversight



Since 2002, the Lake Pontchartrain Basin Restoration Program (PRP) grant program has helped to restore the ecological health of the Basin by developing and funding restoration projects and related scientific and public education projects. The University of New Orleans Research and Technology Foundation (UNORTF) has received grants during that time to make sub-grants to the 16 parishes surrounding the Basin for restoration projects and studies.

As a part of an effort strengthening grant programs oversight, an internal review of the program by the Office of Grants and Debarment (OGD) and Region 6 staff in 2016 revealed at least three problems. First, an amendment to the Federal Water Pollution Control Act in 2011 (enacted December 2012) increased the statutory match for the PRP from 5% to 25%, which created a match deficit totaling \$410,960 for FY13 and FY15 grants. Second, Region 6 has not obtained a Delegation of Authority from the Office of the Administrator to award grants under the PRP. Third, UNORTF improperly uses a 4% "Management Fee" to recover

costs for its administration of the PRP program.

We are exploring UNORTF's proposal to use previously unreported match for Fiscal Years 07-15 to reduce or close the match deficit. OGD and the Office of General Counsel have indicated that a deviation from regulations is possible to accommodate UNORTF's request, pending documentation. EPA is unable to waive match required by statute.

We are working with UNORTF to obtain sufficient documentation for the indirect cost rate it uses for its 4% management fee. Until the Region can determine the nature of these costs and properly budget them in the grant agreement, we have restricted UNORTF's ability to receive payment for the management fee.

We are working on submitting a package to obtain the Delegation of Authority from the Office of the Administrator.

Cross Cutting Programs-New Mexico

EPA Review of PM₁₀ Exceptional Events Demonstrations from New Mexico



On September 28, 2016, the New Mexico Environment Department (NMED) submitted Exceptional Event demonstrations for five 2013 measurements that exceeded the national ambient air quality standards (NAAQS) for PM₁₀. Per 40 CFR 58.14, a state may request to exclude Exceptional Event data from use in attainment regulatory determinations. The core concepts are: a clear causal relationship between event and exceedance, event not reasonably controllable or preventable, and event caused by human activity not likely to recur or a natural event.

NMED requests EPA concur on data exclusions for the following five measurement events:

- A July 7, 2013, exceedance at the West Mesa monitor (35-013-0024) located in Las Cruces, Dona Ana County, about 33 miles north of the Mexico border with a population of over 100,000. NMED claims a wildfire caused this exceedance.
- A November 22, 2013, exceedance at the Desert View monitor (35-013-0021) located in Sunland Park, Dona Ana County, across the state border from El Paso, Texas. Sunland Park has a population of about 15,000. NMED claims high winds caused

this exceedance.

- An October 10, 2013, exceedance at a monitor (35-013-0016) located in Anthony, Dona Ana County, about 21 miles north of the El Paso. The population of the community (Anthony, New Mexico, and Anthony, Texas) is about 14,000. NMED claims high winds caused this exceedance.

- Two measurements from a monitor (35-029-0003) located in Deming, Luna County. Deming is 33 miles from the Mexican border with a population of about 15,000. NMED requests EPA concur on data exclusions for July 4, 2013, and July 26, 2013, exceedances with claimed causes of fireworks and high wind, respectively.

EPA will request additional information from NMED to complete the review.

Decision on PM₁₀ Exceptional Event Demonstration from City of Albuquerque



On September 15, 2016, the City of Albuquerque submitted an Exceptional Events demonstration package for a measurement in 2014 which exceeded the national ambient air quality standards (NAAQS) for PM₁₀. Under 40 CFR 58.14, an air agency may request EPA to exclude data which is the result of an Exceptional Event from use in regulatory determinations concerning area attainment. EPA is likely to concur with the request.

For EPA to concur on the request to exclude data, an air agency must demonstrate to EPA that an Exceptional Event caused the specific air pollution concentration at a particular location. The core concepts for the demonstration are: a clear causal relationship between event and exceedance, event not reasonably controllable or preventable, and event caused by human activity not likely to recur or natural event.

The measurement is from the South Valley monitor located in Albuquerque, New Mexico (35-001-0029). COA requested that EPA concur on a data exclusion for a May 7, 2014, exceedance at the South Valley monitor with a claimed cause of a high wind. The technical evaluation of the demonstration for this exceedance is ongoing. The demonstration appears to show that a High Winds Dust Event (i.e., sustained wind speeds above 25 mph for at least 1 full hour) occurred at the monitor location and that human activities contributing to the exceedance were reasonably controlled.

Abandoned Uranium Mine Wastes



About 70 percent of all the uranium mined in the United States from the 1940's through the 1980's came from the 2,500 square mile Grants Mining District located on Navajo and New Mexico lands. Thousands of exploratory excavations were made and hundreds of major uranium mines and mills were active in the District before being abandoned. The legacy of the uranium mining industry is millions of tons of waste rock and billions of gallons of contaminated water that continue to pose risks to human health and the environment. Little funding was available to address the problems presented by the uranium mining boom until the February 2011 Tronox settlement that resolved the environmental liability of the defunct Kerr McGee corporation. The settlement provided \$900 million to address uranium mine contamination at fifty-five mines located on or adjacent to Navajo Nation lands. Thirty-three of these mines are completely on the Navajo Nation and twenty-two are on private, federal, or state land in New Mexico. Development of remedies for these fifty-five sites requires close coordination between the State of New Mexico, the Navajo Nation and EPA Region 6 [working with New Mexico]

and Region 9 [working with the Navajo]. There is also a subset of mines that do not have funds to address the same or similar environmental issues.

Both Regions 6 and 9 have initiated assessments of the most contaminated of the 55 sites within their jurisdictions to determine the nature and extent contamination and to develop cleanup alternatives. EPA Regions 9 and 6 are holding frequent meetings with state, tribal and community members regarding agency assessments of abandoned uranium mine environmental issues. Alternatives related to transport and disposal are not universally accepted by the state and Navajo Nation. Close coordination continues to be a priority.

Kirtland Air Force Base, Albuquerque



A long term release of jet fuel and aviation gasoline from underground pipelines at Kirtland Air Force Base in Albuquerque, New Mexico, has resulted in a large plume beneath southeast Albuquerque, near the city's drinking water supply wells. The principal contaminant is ethylene dibromide (EDB). EDB has not been detected in city wells so far, and a groundwater pump and treat system was installed in 2016 as an interim measure under the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA).

Health effects from EDB include problems with the liver, stomach, reproductive system, and kidneys, and may increase the risk of cancer. EPA Region 6 has worked closely with the New Mexico Environment Department (NMED), the Air Force and the Albuquerque Water Utility Authority to characterize the plume and to develop interim measures to protect the drinking water wells. EPA developed the groundwater model now used by NMED and the Air Force, and the Region continues to support the State by reviewing reports and providing modeling support.

Near term activities are to test and adjust the pump and treat system to protect the drinking water wells. Long term plans are to eliminate the EDB plume from off-site areas, protecting the drinking water supply wells, and address other fuel contaminants near the base property line. Corrective Action of the fuel spill is being performed under a RCRA hazardous waste permit issued by NMED.

Lead Program Authorization – New Mexico Department of Health



Region 6 began a dialogue with the New Mexico Department of Health (NMDH) Epidemiology Department in November 2016 to discuss New Mexico adopting the Lead Based Paint Program. NMDH has the Centers for Disease Control Lead Grant now, and is building capacity to adopt the EPA Lead Certification programs. EPA is working with NMDH to fund the initial \$50,000 to hire a position which will handle the administrative burden of studying the feasibility of adopting the lead based paint program in New Mexico.

The program will need EPA management approval of the grant funding to move forward. Adoption by New Mexico will require new state legislation, and will take 3-5 years to complete.

.

Los Alamos Municipal Separate Storm Sewer Systems Designation



EPA was petitioned to designate permitting for unregulated storm water discharges in Los Alamos County contributing to violations of water quality standards. The petition cites EPA's duty to issue a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) permit to control urban storm water discharges from Los Alamos National Laboratory (LANL) and Los Alamos County. Several ephemeral and intermittent waters in the Los Alamos area are listed as impaired for one or more pollutants including PCBs, gross alpha, aluminum, copper, zinc, arsenic, selenium, thallium, and mercury.

EPA plans to finalize final designation and plan in March 2017. Los Alamos County leaders and the Department of Energy, the federal agency managing LANL, requested EPA to not designate the area. Local tribal leaders support the designation.

.

Waste Isolation Pilot Project, Carlsbad



The Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) near Carlsbad, New Mexico, is the only permanent nuclear repository for defense related transuranic (TRU) waste. The WIPP was closed in February 2014 after a radiation release occurred in one of the containers in the underground repository 2150 feet below the surface. The Department of Energy (DOE) evaluated the cause of the release, issued an accident investigation report and developed and implemented a corrective action plan to address the problems found in the investigation report. After inspections by DOE, Mine Safety Health Administration, EPA, and the New Mexico Environment Department, (NMED), emplacement of TRU waste resumed on January 4, 2017. DOE says emplacement is at a pace to assure compliance with the enhanced safety procedures and characterization process. DOE currently has over 22,000 containers of TRU waste in storage at DOE sites across the country destined for permanent emplacement at WIPP. DOE released a schedule on February 14, 2017, for TRU shipments over the next 12 months. Shipments are scheduled from Waste Control Specialists in Texas and DOE facilities in Idaho, Oak Ridge, Savannah

River and Los Alamos.

Environmental regulation of the WIPP is the responsibility of NMED for hazardous waste under the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act, with oversight by EPA Region 6. The Office of Radiation and Indoor Air (ORIA) at EPA headquarters is responsible for approving the facility as capable for safely containing radioactive waste under the Land Withdrawal Act and EPA's radioactive waste disposal standards. ORIA is reviewing the current WIPP Compliance Recertification Application (CRA), which EPA declared complete in January. EPA/ORIA needs to make a decision on the CRA by mid-July 2017. EPA/ORIA is also reviewing the Biennial Environmental Compliance Report (BECR) submitted by DOE in October 2016. EPA needs to make a decision on the BECR by April 2017.

Cross Cutting Programs-Oklahoma



Underground Injection Control Program – Osage County

Osage County is the largest county in Oklahoma by area with a total area of 2,304 square miles. The Osage Nation owns all subsurface mineral rights within Osage County, as the rights were retained when surface lands were allotted in 1906 (Osage Allotment Act of 1906, 34 Stat. 539).

The Osage Minerals Council is vested by the Osage Nation Constitution to develop and administer the Osage Mineral Estate. BIA, under delegation from the Secretary of the Interior, administers the development of oil and gas resources in Osage County for the benefit of the Osage Nation. Leases are subject to the consent of the Osage Minerals Council and approval of the BIA Superintendent. Since Osage County is Indian Country, EPA administers the UIC program, issuing UIC permits for enhanced recovery and disposal operations, and ensuring compliance. The Osage Nation Environmental and Natural Resources Department within the Osage National Tribal Council works under a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) with EPA to assist in administering the UIC Program.

Two significant earthquakes (Pawnee events, M5.8 on September 3, 2016, and M4.3 on November 1, 2016) resulted in the delineation of areas of concern which included portions of Osage County. In response to larger scale earthquakes, Oklahoma has

developed an approach where OCC works with the Oklahoma Geologic Survey to delineate areas of concern, which contain injection wells which should have operational changes to diminish risk of additional seismic activity. EPA, in close cooperation with Oklahoma Corporation Commission (OCC), Osage Nation Minerals Council, Osage Nation Environmental staff, United States Geological Survey (USGS), and Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA), responded quickly to these events to shut in or reduce or cap injection volumes in disposal wells in the area. EPA has an ongoing program to work with OCC and the Osage Nation to coordinate efforts to conduct effective oversight of UIC operations to reduce the possibility of future earthquakes.

Cross Cutting Programs-Texas

SSO Enforcement -- Corpus Christi and Houston



Corpus Christi owns and operates six wastewater treatment plants (WWTPs). Performance and operating assessments of the WWTPs indicate 120 effluent violations since 2007 from its plants. The City repeatedly violated effluent limits set forth in its National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System permit for flow, enterococci, fecal coliform, total suspended solids, biological oxygen demand, ammonia, nitrogen, residual chlorine and pH. The causes of violations include: (1) untreated discharges of sewage from the waste water collection system, (2) failure to comply with operation and maintenance conditions contained in its permits due to WWTP discharges, (3) exceedances of effluent limits contained in permits due to WWTPs discharges, (4) discharges of untreated wastewater into waters of the United States and State waters without a permit, and (5) creating an imminent risk of harm to human health and the environment by causing dangerously high levels of bacteria in recreational waters located in and around the City. As a result, the Region referred the case to the U.S. Department of Justice in August 2011 to address unauthorized SSO and effluent discharges in violation of the Clean Water Act.

EPA, DOJ, and the State of Texas are near a settlement with the City in which Corpus Christi shall pay a civil penalty of \$1 million

that will be split between Texas and the United States, along with a Supplemental Environmental Project (SEP) valued at \$600,000. The corrective measures will cost more than \$632 million over the next 10 years and \$885 million over the next 30 years.

Performance evaluation in 2009 of Houston's Sanitary Sewer Overflows (SSOs) indicated that Houston has the most extensive SSO problem in Region 6. In a five-year period, EPA identified more than 18,000 SSOs. The City of Houston owns and operates 40 wastewater treatment plants (WWTPs) and is the second largest municipality in the United States with a separate sewer system. Houston has a significantly greater number of SSOs than other large municipalities across the country. EPA Region referred the case to the U.S. Department of Justice in January of 2009 to address the SSO and effluent violations of the Clean Water Act.

The parties have reached an agreement in principle in which Houston will pay a penalty of \$4.4 million that will be split between the State of Texas and the United States and the City will conduct a Supplemental Environmental Project (SEP) valued at \$1.5 million. The corrective action of Houston's sewer collection system and wastewater treatment plants will likely cost more than \$5 billion over a period of 22 to 27 years.

Donna Canal Superfund Site



The Donna Reservoir and Canal System Superfund Site is located in Hidalgo County, Texas, near the Texas/Mexico border. The local Irrigation District pumps water from the Rio Grande River and transfers the water through several miles of canals for irrigation and drinking water supply. The canal system is contaminated with polychlorinated biphenyls in the water column, sediment, and fish. Local residents catch and consume contaminated fish from the canal despite no-fishing orders issued by the State. Conflicting information about land ownership have delayed the execution of a final remedy for the site.

Since 2008 EPA conducted several fish removal actions to prevent consumption of contaminated fish. To date, nearly 40,000 fish have been removed and a public outreach program has focused on informing the public to avoid fishing in the system. Despite these efforts, the fish population rebounded and people resumed consuming contaminated fish. EPA will therefore conduct another fish removal action in early 2017.

Extensive EPA studies have identified the source of contamination as a large, 90-year-old 1,200-foot-long, underground pipe. A remedy for the site has not been proposed due to conflicting information regarding ownership of portions of the pipe and canal. EPA is working with federal, state and local government stakeholders to clarify ownership. EPA expects to issue a proposed plan of action for public input later this year.

Petition to Withdraw Texas' Federally Approved/Authorized Permitting Programs



On January 11, 2016, the Environmental Defense Fund and Caddo Lake Institute filed a Petition for Administrative Action with EPA Region 6 asking EPA to withdraw National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permitting authority under the Clean Water Act (CWA) from the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (TCEQ) and requesting that EPA find Texas's new source review (NSR) permitting program under the Clean Air Act (CAA) substantially inadequate.

The Petition alleges that amendments adopted by Texas in 2015 to the State's Contested Case Hearing process restrict public participation in the permitting process contrary to Texas's federally approved/authorized permitting programs by 1) restricting the public's ability to obtain judicial review of permitting decisions, 2) reducing opportunities for public participation by increasing the burden on permit opponents in a Contested Case Hearing, and 3) providing inadequate resources for implementation and enforcement of the CWA and CAA.

The Petition and the revisions themselves also highlight a

broader NPDES, Title V, and NSR Authorization Issue. EPA based its 1998 authorization of the Texas CWA NPDES program upon a finding that participation in a Contested Case Hearing was not a prerequisite to judicial review. Texas made the same assertion during EPA's approval of Texas's Title V and NSR programs under the CAA. EPA is working with the State to understand the meaning of recent State court decisions, as well as statements made by the Texas Attorney General, which may call into question the adequacy of public participation in the State's programs.

EPA has begun an initial, informal investigation into the allegations in the Petition. The objective of this investigation, which is provided for under the CWA and EPA's implementing regulations, is to gather enough information to reach a preliminary assessment as to whether cause exists to initiate formal withdrawal proceedings. There is no statutory or regulatory deadline to complete the informal investigation. At some point the Petitioners may seek to have the Federal Court set a schedule for an EPA decision on the petitions.

Decision on 8-hour Ozone Exceptional Event Request for El Paso



On September 27, 2016, the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (TCEQ) submitted an exceptional event exceedance demonstration package to EPA Region 6. The TCEQ requested EPA's concurrence that an exceedance of the air quality 8-hour ozone concentration value on June 21, 2015, at the University of Texas at El Paso monitor was due to an exceptional event. The TCEQ claimed the exceptional event was caused by wildfire emissions from southeastern Arizona.

EPA allows for high concentrations associated with exceptional events, such as wildfires, to be set aside and not used in design value calculations. The TCEQ's June 21, 2015, package cites wildfires in Arizona as the exceptional event. EPA's decision on the exceptional event is pending a follow-up technical meeting with the state and industries. EPA, TCEQ and industry represen-

tative met in Dallas on January 24, 2017, and March 10, 2017 to determine if additional information is needed before a decision is reached by the agency. EPA is working with the State of Texas on its information to demonstrate the transport of pollution from Arizona and Mexico fires.

Texas Regional Haze BART Federal Implementation Plan



EPA Region 6 published a proposal in the Federal Register on 4 January 2017, concerning the Best Available Retrofit (BART) requirements of the Regional Haze Rule. EPA recently extended our public comment period by 60 days to 5 May 2017. Under Court Order Consent Decree, EPA must finalize our decision by 9 September 2017.

This proposal involves our review of certain portions of Texas' plans for improving regional haze, and for controlling the transport of pollution that would impair visibility in other states. EPA proposed air pollution controls for 16 Texas coal-fired power plant units. We proposed Sulfur Dioxide (SO₂) emission limits for 29 Electricity Generating Units (EGUs). This includes emission limits corresponding to the installation of SO₂ scrubbers at 12 EGUs, emission limits corresponding to the upgrading of

scrubbers at 4 EGUs, and an emission limit corresponding to the maintenance of scrubbers at 2 EGUs. We proposed particulate matter (PM) limits for 11 EGUs that either fire gas exclusively, or fire gas in conjunction with fuel oil. We do not anticipate that any additional PM controls will be needed to comply with these limits. Our proposed limits are expected to reduce emissions of SO₂ from 16 EGUs and would cut emissions by about 89 to 98 percent, resulting in a reduction of over 194,000 tons of SO₂ per year.

San Jacinto Superfund Site



The San Jacinto River Waste Pits Superfund Site is situated east of Houston, Texas. Pits were built in the mid-1960s along the banks of the San Jacinto River and used for disposal of pulp wastes containing dioxins. The waste pits are partially submerged in the river due to regional subsidence. A temporary armored cap was completed in 2011 under an EPA order to prevent continuing releases and direct contact with the waste material. A final permanent remedy is under consideration by EPA.

To support the final remedy, an investigation and assessment of cleanup alternatives was conducted and EPA issued a proposed plan of action in September 2016 for public comment. The proposed plan recommended removal of the waste material and disposal at an off-site disposal facility. Other cleanup alternatives considered include capping and solidification in place. The 60-day comment period was extended 45 days by request to allow more time to consider the complex site issues. The EPA received a large number of comments, including over 6,000 written comments, 48,000 signatures on petitions, and about 2,800 pages of detailed technical comments. The comments from local residents generally support removal and off-site disposal. The responsible

parties and some down-stream residents support capping in place.

EPA is required to respond to all public comments prior to selection of the final remedy. Other factors that must be considered include protection of human health and long-term effectiveness. The determination of long-term effectiveness is critical at this site due to the location in a dynamic river system that is susceptible to storms and hurricanes. The EPA recommended removal to address the risk of a hurricane causing a sudden large release of dioxin wastes should the cap fail. EPA is currently preparing responses to the detailed technical comments on the proposed plan and expects to issue a final cleanup decision later this year.

Waste Control Specialists, Andrews County



In April 2014, transuranic (TRU) waste mixed with hazardous waste was shipped from Los Alamos National Lab (LANL) to Waste Control Specialists (WCS) in Andrews County, Texas, for temporary storage. WCS is a commercial waste transfer, treatment, storage and disposal facility located about 30 miles west of the town of Andrews near the Texas/New Mexico border.

WCS is about 100 miles from the Waste Isolation Pilot Plan (WIPP) in Southeastern New Mexico. This waste would normally have been shipped directly to WIPP for emplacement; however, WIPP had been closed due to a radiation release in February 2014. It was eventually determined that a portion of the LANL waste at WCS was a part of the same waste stream as the waste that led to the radiation release at WIPP. That portion was segregated at WCS for safety reasons and placed in a landfill.


The Department of Energy (DOE) is evaluating 462 of the 582 containers that are not of the suspect waste stream to determine when they can be shipped to the WIPP. The remaining 120 containers will require further treatment before they can be shipped. All shipments will be escorted by DOE, and shipments are expected to be completed in two weeks once they begin. WCS is regulated by the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (TCEQ) through their hazardous waste program and by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. EPA's role is oversight of the TCEQ hazardous waste program.



District 3
Steve Womack (R)




District 4
Bruce Westerman (R)



ARKANSAS

115th U.S. Congressional Districts

There are no Federally recognized tribes in Arkansas.



District 01



District 1
Rick Crawford (R)



District 2
French Hill (R)

Governor



Asa Hutchinson (R)

Director

Arkansas Department of
Environmental Quality




Becky Keogh



Senator John Boozman (R)



Senator Tom Cotton (R)




Data Sources

Base Features: U.S. Census Bureau.

115th Congressional Districts: U.S. Census Bureau.

Photos: Respective websites.

Map Created by EPA Region 6 Superfund GIS
Support for EPA Region 6 External Affairs.
February 8, 2017. Map ID 20170208ML01.



District 04

District 05

District 03

District 06

District 02



District 4
Mike Johnson (R)



District 5
Ralph Abraham (R)



District 3
Clay Higgins (R)



District 2
Cedric Richmond (D)

LOUISIANA

115th U.S. Congressional Districts and Tribal Lands

Governor



John Bel Edwards (D)

Secretary

LA Department of Environmental Quality



Chuck Carr Brown




Senator Bill Cassidy (R)



Senator John Neely Kennedy (R)



District 6
Garret Graves (R)



Legend

★	State Capitol	Congressional District
—	Interstate	01
▭	Tribal Land	02
▭	Parish	03
▭	State	04
		05
		06

Data Sources

Base Features: U.S. Census Bureau.

115th Congressional Districts: U.S. Census Bureau.

Photos: Respective websites.

Map Created by EPA Region 6 Superfund GIS
Support for EPA Region 6 External Affairs.


February 8, 2017. Map ID 20170208ML04.



District 3
Ben Lujan (D)




District 2
Steve Pearce (R)



NEW MEXICO

115th U.S. Congressional Districts and Tribal Lands



Governor



Susana Martinez (R)

Secretary

NM Environment Department



Butch Tongate





Senator Tom Udall (D)



Senator Martin Heinrich (D)



District 1
Michelle Lujan Grisham (D)



Data Sources
Base Features: U.S. Census Bureau.
115th Congressional Districts: U.S. Census Bureau.
Photos: Respective websites.

Map Created by EPA Region 6 Superfund GIS
Support for EPA Region 6 External Affairs.
February 8, 2017. Map ID 20170208ML03.

OKLAHOMA Tribal Lands




Data Sources
Base Features: U.S. Census Bureau, NAVTEQ.

Map Created by EPA Region 6 Superfund GIS
Support for EPA Region 6 External Affairs.
February 14, 2017. Map ID 20170214ML03.

Legend

- ★ State Capitol
- Major City or Town
- Interstate
- ▭ Tribal Land
- ▭ County
- ▭ State





Governor



Greg Abbott (R)

Chairman

TX Commission on Environmental Quality




Bryan Shaw



Senator John Cornyn (R)



Senator Ted Cruz (R)



TEXAS

115th U.S. Congressional Districts and Tribal Lands

Representatives by District



1. Louie Gohmert (R)



2. Ted Poe (R)



3. Sam Johnson (R)



4. John Ratcliffe (R)



5. Jeb Hensarling (R)



6. Joe Barton (R)



7. John Abney Culberson (R)



8. Kevin Brady (R)



9. Al Green (D)



10. Michael T. McCaul (R)



11. Mike Conaway (R)



12. Kay Granger (R)



25. Roger Williams (R)



26. Michael C. Burgess (R)



27. Blake Farenthold (R)



28. Henry Cuellar (D)



29. Gene Green (D)



30. Eddie Bernice Johnson (D)



13. Mac Thornberry (R)



14. Randy Weber (R)



15. Vicente Gonzalez (D)



16. Beto O'Rourke (D)



17. Bill Flores (R)



18. Sheila Jackson-Lee (D)



19. Jodey Arrington (R)



20. Joaquin Castro (D)



21. Lamar S. Smith (R)



22. Pete Olson (R)



23. Will Hurd (R)



24. Kenny Marchant (R)



31. John R. Carter (R)



32. Pete Sessions (R)



33. Marc Veasey (D)




34. Filemon Vela (D)



35. Lloyd Doggett (D)



36. Brian Babin (R)



U.S. EPA Region 6
1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200
Dallas, TX 75202

A p r i l 2 0 1 7

